APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/998,347	11/30/2001	Hendra Suwanda	CA920000046US1	7250

46320   7590   09/07/2007
CAREY, RODRIGUEZ, GREENBERG & PAUL, LLP
STEVEN M. GREENBERG
950 PENINSULA CORPORATE CIRCLE
SUITE 3020
BOCA RATON, FL 33487

EXAMINER
SHRESTHA, BIJENDRA K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3691	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 August 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-17 and 20* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-17 and 20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date *8/20/2007*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-20 are presented for examination. Applicant filed an amendment on

05/29/2007 amending all independent claims 2-3 and 12-13, and canceling claims 18-

19. Applicant is also required to refer to all the references cited but not relied on while

responding to the office action (see MPEP § 37 CFR 1.111(c)). After careful

consideration of applicant's arguments and amendments, new grounds of rejections of

claims necessitated by Applicant's amendment are established in the instant application

as set forth in detail below.

Objections

2.   The Examiner respectfully withdraws objection to summary of invention and

claims 16-17 in response to the Applicant arguments. The Examiner maintains objection

to claim 9 as the Applicant fails to define "author" in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of
> making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the
> art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall
> set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4.   Claim 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply

with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not

described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it

pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claims 1-10 recite various means and steps of performing the recited claims

which is shown by flow charts but fails point out how it is implemented by system. The

applicant fails to illustrate "the computer system" to implement the recited claims. The

Examiner maintains that one of ordinary skill in art would not know how computer

system is used in contract-based electronic catalogs as claimed by the Applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6.   Claims 1-17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by

Hare et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,850,900 (reference A in attached PTO-892).

7.   As per claim 1, Hare et al. teach a computer system for defining a set of

electronic catalogs for a defined product universe (see Fig. 1 and 2),

each of the catalogs in the set having an associated contract (see Fig. 11J),

users of the electronic catalogs each being associated with one of the contracts (see

Fig. 1; column 2, lines 38-42; column 9, lines 26-45, 66-67 to column 10, lines 1-2, lines

32-35; column 16, lines 16-27);

each catalog having a unique catalog identifier (see Fig. 6L; where catalog

identifier is BCB0513) and

each contract having a unique contract identifier (see Fig. 11Q; where unique

contract # is TOC-0003),

the computer system comprising

means for generating, storing and maintaining a graph representing the

electronic catalogs (see Fig. 1; Content Transform Application (16), Content

Management Application (18) and Database (20); column 9, lines 46-67 to column 10,

lines 1-16);

each node in the graph containing data (see Fig. 11A-Q for contract node data;

Fig. 12 A-J for category and product node data; and Fig. 15A-G for catalog node data);

and

each edge in the graph connecting two nodes and being associated with one or

more catalog or contract identifiers (see Fig. 11 J, 11 L for catalogs; where contract

catalog is associated with gc-sab-0600, cabinet, ms-cabinets, and scott ; Fig. 12C for

catalog (TPN(296)) and categories (absorber, bits, batteries etc.); Fig. 12D for category

(Spring Clamp) and products (different types of Spring Clamp); Fig. 12E detailed

information of a products (under contract scott_3-11-2000);

means for traversing the graph in response to user requests, the traversal of the graph being constrained by the catalog or contract identifiers associated with the edges in the graph (see Fig. 14; column 21, lines 29-55)); and

means for displaying to the user the data at reached nodes in the graph traversal (see Fig. 3; where Presentation (50) in GUI provides means for displaying data at reached nodes).

8.   As per claim 2, Hare et al. teach claim 1 as described above. Hare et al. further teach the computer system in which the nodes comprise contract nodes, catalog nodes, category nodes, product nodes and price nodes, in which

child nodes for contract nodes comprise catalog nodes (see Fig. 11 J);

a catalog node may have alternatively, child category nodes or child product nodes (see Fig. 15B (category node); Fig.15C and Fig. 15E (product node) for Master catalog);

child nodes for category nodes comprise product nodes (see Fig. 7A);

child nodes for product nodes comprise price nodes, and in which each parent node has a potential plurality of child nodes (see Fig. 12D; where product node (Spring Clamp) has child nodes as contract price and supplier price; There are five categories of Spring Clamp).

9.   As per claim 3, Hare et al. teach claim 2 as described above. Hare et al. further teach the computer system in which

each edge between a contract node and a catalog node is associated with a contract identifier (see Fig. 9; Fig. 11J-L);

each edge between a catalog node and a category node is associated with a

catalog identifier (see Fig. 7A; each edge is associated with catalog identifier TPN

(16378) of Master catalog);

each edge between a category node and a product node is associated with a

catalog identifier (see Fig. 7B; each edge is associated with catalog identifier TPN

(17378) of Master catalog); and

each edge between a product node and a price node is associated with a

contract identifier (see Fig. 12D; each edge is associated with Buyer Contract # scott_3-

11-2000).

10.   As per claim 4, Hare et al. teach claim 3 as described above. Hare et al. further

teach the computer system in which the

means for traversing the graph comprises means for traversing an edge in

response to a user request only (see Fig. 9) when

either the contract identifier for the contract with which a user is associated (see

Fig. 25A) or

the catalog identifier for the catalog with which the user's contract is associated

matches the identifier associated with that edge in the graph (see Fig. 11A-11J; where

means for traversing an edge is created for contract # 0020 so that user can only

access catalogs as shown in Fig. 11J).

11.   As per claim 5, Hare et al. teach claim 2 as described above. Hare et al. further

teach the computer system in which

each contract node comprises associated contract information and time interval attributes (see Fig. 11A; Fig. 11Q),

each product node comprises an associated product identifier attribute (see Fig.12E); and

each price node comprises associated amount, currency and effective date attributes (see Fig. 12E; where detailed price information for product: Spring Clamp- 3" is displayed).

12.   As per claim 6, Hare et al. teach claim 1 as described above. Hare et al. further teach the computer system in which

the graph is represented by a relational database table (see Fig. 2; where database server receives information and transmits information to application server; relationship among the nodes and edge are shown tabular format; Examiner interprets the graph is represented by relational database table).

13.   As per claim 7, Hare et al. teach claim 2 as described above. Hare et al. further teach the computer system in which

a catalog node may have child catalog nodes (see Fig. 9; column 10, lines 11-14; column 16, lines 60-67).

14.   As per claim 8, Hare et al. teach claim 2 as described above. Hare et al. further teach the computer system in which

a category node may have child category nodes and in which each edge between a category node and a category node is associated with a catalog identifier (see Fig. 6N where Master catalog with catalog identifier TPN (16378) has child

category node "Abrasives"; Abrasives also holds following child category nodes which is

different types of Abrasives: Disks, Emery Cloth, Grinding Stone, Grinding Wheel,

Mounted Wheels and so on.. which is associated with catalog TPN (16378)).

15.   As per claim 9, Hare et al. teach 1, 2, 3, or 4 as described above. Hare et al.

further teach the computer system comprising a graphical user interface tool

for presenting a master catalog to a catalog author (see Fig. 15 A; Fig. 15B;

column 21, lines 63-66);

for permitting the catalog author to filter the nodes and edges in the master

catalog, and to define new nodes and edges to create a new catalog (see Fig. 15C; Fig.

15D; column 21, lines 66-67; column 22, lines 1-6).

16.   As per claim 10, Hare et al. teach claim 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 or 8 as described

above. Hare et al. further teach a computer program product for defining a set of

electronic catalogs, the computer program product

comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable code means

embodied in said medium (see column 11, lines 49-55 ; where Java, JavaScript, XML,

EJB code are used by the system); and

comprising computer readable program code means for implementing the

computer system of claims 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5 , 6 , 7 or 8 (see Fig. 1; column 9, lines 26-45).

17.   As per claim 11, Hare et al. teach a method for defining and displaying a set of

electronic catalogs for a defined product universe (see Fig. 1 and 2), each of the

catalogs in the set having an associated contract (see Fig. 11J), users of the electronic

catalogs each being associated with one of the contracts (see Figs. 25 A-F), each

catalog having a unique catalog identifier (see Fig. 6L; where catalog identifier is

BCB0513) and each contract having a unique contract identifier (see Fig. 11Q; where

unique contract # is TOC-0003), the method comprising the following steps:

generating, storing and maintaining a graph representing the electronic catalogs

(see Figs. 7A-C; column 16, lines 16-28);

each node in the graph containing data (see Fig. 11A-Q for contract node

data; Fig. 12 A-J for category and product node data; and Fig. 15A-G for catalog node

data); and

each edge in the graph connecting two nodes and being associated with

one or more catalog or contract identifiers (see Fig. 11 J, Fig. 11 L for catalogs; Fig.

12C for catalog and categories; Fig. 12D for category and products (or items); Fig. 12E

detailed information of a products (under contract scott_3-11-2000));

traversing the graph in response to user requests, the traversal of the graph

being constrained by the catalog or contract identifiers associated with the edges in the

graph (see Fig. 1; column 16-35); and

displaying to the user the data at reached nodes in the graph traversal (see Fig.

3; where Presentation (50) in GUI provides means for displaying data at reached

nodes).

18.   As per claim 12, Hare et al. teach claim 11 as described above. Hare et al.

further teach the method in which the nodes comprise contract nodes, catalog nodes,

category nodes, product nodes and price nodes, in which

child nodes for a contract node comprise catalog nodes(see Fig. 11 J);

a catalog node may have alternatively, child category nodes or child product

nodes (see Fig. 15B (category node); Fig.15C and15E (product node) for Master

catalog));

child nodes for category nodes comprise product nodes (see Fig. 7A);

child nodes for product nodes comprise price nodes, and in which each parent

node has a potential plurality of child nodes (see Fig. 12D; where product node (Spring

Clamp) has child nodes as contract price and supplier price; There are five categories of

Spring Clamp). .

19.   As per claim 13, Hare et al. teach claim 12 as described above. Hare et al.

further teach the method in which

each edge between a contract node and a catalog node is associated with a

contract identifier (see Fig. 9; Fig.11J-L);

each edge between a catalog node and a category node is associated with a

catalog identifier (see Fig. 7A; each edge is associated with catalog identifier TPN

(16378) of Master catalog);

each edge between a category node and a product node is associated with a

catalog identifier (see Fig. 7B; each edge is associated with catalog identifier TPN

(17378) of Master catalog); and

each edge between a product node and a price node is associated with a

contract identifier (see Fig. 12D; each edge is associated with Buyer contract # scott_3-

11-2000).

20.   As per claim 13, Hare et al. teach claim 12 as described above. Hare et al.

further teach the method in which the step of traversing the graph comprises the step of

comparing the contract identifier for the contract with which a user is associated

(see Fig. 25A) or

the catalog identifier for the catalog with which the user's contract is associated

and the identifier associated with a reached edge in the graph and further comprises the

step of traversing that reached edge only when the comparison shows a match

condition (see Fig. 11A-11J; where means for traversing an edge is created for contract

0020 so that user can only access catalogs as shown in Fig. 11J).

21.   As per claim 15, Hare et al teach claim 11, 12, 13, or 14 as described above.

Hare et al. further teach a computer program product for defining and displaying a set of

electronic catalogs, the computer program product comprising   a computer usable

medium having computer readable code means embodied in said medium, comprising

computer readable program code means for carrying out the method (see column 11,

lines 49-55; where Java, JavaScript, XML, EJB code are used by the system).

22.   As per claim 16, Hare et al. teach claim 15 as described above. Hare et al.

further teach the computer program product wherein   said computer readable code

means comprises

a computer readable signal and said medium comprises a computer readable

signal-bearing medium (see Fig. 2; column 11, lines 62-67; column 12, lines 1-2; where

communication access via Internet and system dedicated access through signal

readable medium Cisco Router 2700 is displayed).

23.   As per claim 17, Hare et al. teach claim 16 as described above. Hare et al.

further teach the computer program product wherein

    said medium is a recordable data storage medium (see Fig. 3; column 12, lines

29-31, 40-41; where data is stored in computer and application database).

24.   As per claim 20, Hare et al. teach claim 11, 12, 13 or 14 as described above.

Hare et al. further teach the computer program comprising

    computer program code means adapted to perform all the steps when said

program is run on a computer system (see Fig. 1; column 49-52).

Response to Arguments

25.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 11 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

    The Examiner considered the applicant arguments but found not persuasive. It

should be pointed out that the all the claims are examined based on broad interpretation

of the presented claims. As per claims 1 and 11, The Applicant argument is that claim

recitations "users of the electronic catalogs each being associated with one of the

contracts; means for generating, storing and maintaining a graph representing

electronic catalogs" was not taught by Hare et al. The examiner respectfully disagrees.

Hare et al. teach that supplier uses the general catalog application 18C to create one or

more general catalogs which are attached to one or more contracts which are

negotiated with buyer (see Fig. 1; column 9, lines 66-67 to column 10, lines 1-2): the

supplier 12 attaches the general catalog to the contract using contract management

application 22 and submit or sends the contract to the buyer 14 using the electronic

market place (see Fig. 1; column 10, lines 32-35). Hare et al. further teach that after

buyer 14, enters into one or more contracts with one or more suppliers 12, the system

creates a master catalog for the buyer which include all general catalogs from all of the

contracts the buyer has entered into with one or more suppliers (see Fig. 1; column 10,

lines 7-12).

The Applicant further argues that claim recited "a graph" to represent "electronic

catalogs" rather than a single catalog referred by Hare et al. and reference Fig. 7A-C is

not a graph. As per reference of **dictionary.com**, graph has been defined as "a diagram

representing a system of connections or interrelations among two or more things by a

number of distinctive dots, lines, bars, etc". As can be seen from Fig. 7A-C, these

display could be represented in graphical form by connecting by lines; these Figures

shows <u>interrelationship among two or more things,</u> for example catalogue TPN (16378)

and abrasives, batteries and bearings etc. Similarly, Fig. 11J and 11L were cited to

show how contract 0020 (edge) contains contract catalogs (nodes) gc-sabs-0600,

cabinet, ms-cabinets and scott.

Conclusion

26.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosures. The following are pertinent to current invention, though not

relied upon:

Barnes et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,970, 475) teach electronic procurement system

and method for trading partners.

Baumann et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,082,408) teach system and method for

ordering items using electronic catalog via Internet.

Blutinger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,231,566) teach method and apparatus for

producing catalog.

Fohn et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,460,025) teach intelligent exploration through

multiple hierarchies using entity relevance.

Hamrick (U.S. Patent No. 5,451,998) teaches home shopping video catalog.

Johnson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,055,516) teach electronic sourcing system.

Povilus (U.S. Patent No. 5,740,425) teaches data structure and method for

publishing electronic and printed product catalogs.

Rofrano (U.S. Patent No. 6,035,283) teach method and apparatus for producing

catalog.

Wolin (U.S. Patent No. 6,751,600) teaches method for automatic categorization

of items.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Bijendra K. Shrestha whose telephone number is (571)

270-1374. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00AM-4:30PM (Monday-

Friday); 2nd Friday OFF. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are

unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on (571)

272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or

proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Bijendra K. Shrestha

(517)270-1374

HANI M. KAZIMI
PRIMARY EXAMINER